

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/971,131             | TUTHILL, JAMES C.   |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Dana Ross              | 3722                |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Dana Ross.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Warren Haines (Reg. No. 40,632).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 September 2000
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Previously allowed subject matter should not have been indicated as allowable in the previous Office Action.*

Claims discussed:

8 and 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Bias

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Previous office action had incorrectly indicated allowance of claim language of "including a flared end bent towards the center of said spindle nut retainer". An Office Action to correct the indication of allowable subject matter was not sent out. The incorrectly allowed claim language was then inserted by Applicant into independent claims 8 and 13. Examiner called to discuss the reasons the claim terminology was not allowable. Discussed the defining of claim language to overcome the prior art of Bias. Agreement could not be reached and after further review, the suggested claim language by Examiner is withdrawn as not overcoming the prior art of Bias. Bias teaches a flared end with an "outer peripheral edge" which faces towards the center of the spindle nut retainer as is seen in fig. 3 of Bias.